



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRENUPTIAL RITE IN THE NEW CALLIMACHUS

BY DUANE REED STUART

The opening lines of the new fragment of the *Aetia* of Callimachus *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* VII (1910), 15 ff., plunge the reader into the midst of the story. It is the night before the day set for the wedding of Cydippe and the Naxian suitor, the rival of Acontius:

ἤδη καὶ κούρῳ παρθένος εὐνάσατο,
τέθμον ὥς ἐκέλευε προνύμφιον ὕπνον ἰαῦσαι
ἄρσενι τὴν τάλιν παιδί σὺν ἀμφιθαλεί.
Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύνον, κύνον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρὲ
θυμέ, σύ γ' αἰείσῃ καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίῃ.

Thus read the first five lines of the papyrus. To the variant *αὐτίκα* for *ἄρσενι* I shall subsequently revert.

On the island of Naxos custom ordained that on the eve of the wedding the bride should share the bed of a *κούρος*. This, at least, is clear. But who was the *κούρος* here alluded to? The absent lover, Acontius, his Naxian rival, or neither? Mr. Hunt and Professor Murray in their interpretations of the passage betray a laudable reluctance to spoil the romance of the situation. The editor of the papyrus regards the words *ἤδη . . . φασί* as the conclusion of a monologue of the lorn Acontius, who is sorrowing because "Cydippe had not immediately followed up her (unintentional) declaration that she would marry him after the custom of the maidens of her own island." This explanation saves the amenities at the expense of the probabilities and has been accepted by no one. *Κούρῳ* is a very impersonal term for Acontius to apply to himself—we need at least a *τῷδε*. Mr. Hunt translates: "already the maid had been couched with the youth," etc. The aorist *εὐνάσατο* is hard to reconcile with the notion of a lament, since the lover is not narrating what actually occurred but what might have been. The presence of an *ἄν* would do wonders for Mr. Hunt's interpretation—but the *ἄν* is not here. The poet himself is surely speaking. Professor Murray, in the editor's note on the passage,

is credited with a different device for avoiding the embarrassment of a literal explanation. He suggests that the reference is not to Acontius and Cydippe but to the participants in the solemnities of the *ἱερὸς γάμος* as celebrated at Naxos.

Leo in *Nachr. d. Kgl. Gesells. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1910), p. 57, displays greater hardihood. Callimachus in no equivocal language relates that "Kydippe habe mit ihrem erklärten Bräutigam das in Naxos übliche Brautbeilager in der Nacht vor der Hochzeit bereits gefeiert." Leo admits that this is an unlovely episode in a pretty story and suggests that Ovid and Aristænetus deliberately omitted allusion to the rite in their versions. Callimachus, on the other hand, had an antiquarian interest in mentioning the rite and tracing it to its *αἴτιον*. Furthermore, we must remember that Cydippe was not in love with Acontius, hence without heartburning or scruple could conform to the custom of her country.

To these comments we may subscribe, in so far as they characterize the attitude of the poet or relate to the circumstances attendant on the story. However, Professor Leo overlooked a consequence of his view which is, to say the least, disconcerting. If the *κοῦρος* is the Naxian and if his connection with Cydippe had gone so far as Professor Leo is willing to believe, what are we to think about the following lines (44 ff.) in which is portrayed the final triumph of the love of Acontius?

οὐ σε δοκέω τημοῦτος, Ἀκόντιε, νυκτὸς ἐκείνης
 ἀντί κε τῆς μίτρης ἦψαο παρθενίης
 οὐ σφυρὸν Ἰφίκλειον ἐπιτρέχον ἀσταχέσσιν
 δέξασθαι.

In Callimachus *παρθένιος* has the strict connotation *virginalis castitas*—see Kuiper *Studia Callimachea* (Leyden, 1896), p. 48. Was the "Brautbeilager" a mere form? However, we may excuse Professor Leo from resolving the difficulty. His explanation, as well as those of Messrs. Hunt and Murray, rests on the assumption that *κοῦρος* means "youth." This view has been challenged, I believe, properly. The case against it, nevertheless, can be materially strengthened.

According to Mr. Housman, in the *Classical Quarterly* IV (1910), 114–15, the correct interpretation of the passage is one which, by

comparison with Leo's, might be inscribed *virginibus puerisque*. *Κοῦρος* is to be translated "boy." Mr. Housman cites no especial evidence which makes for his opinion but confines himself to the assertion that the retention of ἄρσενι—on which he rightly insists—makes Mr. Hunt's interpretation "more plainly impossible." The last word on the subject is contained in an article by M. Puech in the *Revue des Études Grecques* XXIII (1910), 260. The author, reiterating Housman's view, recalls the well-known fact that *κοῦρος*, *κούρη*, and the cognate *κουρίζειν* frequently refer in Callimachus to babies or young children. See Kuiper *Studia Call.* 112.

Now, all will acknowledge that the linguistic evidence by itself is not final. Of course *κοῦρος*, in Callimachus as well as elsewhere, *may* mean "infant." In applying the word to the unborn Apollo, *Hym. ad Del.* iv. 214, Callimachus had the high authority of the Homeric poems to sanction the usage. In *Iliad* vi. 58 we read: ὄν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ | *κοῦρον* ἔόντα φέροι, where, in Mr. Leaf's note, "the use of *κοῦρος* to signify 'babe' is quite unique; it elsewhere connotes rather a man in the prime of life," we are, of course, to insert after "elsewhere" the phrase "in Homer." Other apposite instances, which are not cited in Liddell and Scott but have been encountered casually in reading, are Theocritus *Id.* xvii. 66, where the word is used of the new-born Ptolemy, who has been called *βρέφος* in the preceding line, and Nonnus, *Dionys.* ix. 26-27, where, as is also plain from the context, *κοῦρος* connotes *βρέφος*. This use of the word was evidently approved by the poets, at least by those of the high style, from early times to late.

On the other hand, as we should naturally expect, Callimachus did not use the word in this sense only. Lads of school age, boys old enough to inspire the ardent admiration of their elders of the same sex, are called *κοῦροι* in frags. 107 and 169. In other fragments it is difficult to fix the age to which the term has reference, although in this connection it is interesting to note that the older critics hazarded the suggestion that the *κοῦρος* of frag. 169 is Acontius. At all events, it is certain that, since the use of the word in the sense of *adulescens* was part and parcel of the diction of Greek poetry, Callimachus would have applied the epithet to youths and young men as freely as does Theocritus. Hence, as I have before

said, it is necessary to reinforce the linguistic evidence in order fully to justify the assertion that *κούρος* in l. 1 of the papyrus *must* mean *βρέφος* or *παιδίον*. *Παῖς* in l. 3, it is quite superfluous to say, is no more definitive than *κούρος*.

To be sure, M. Puech goes a step beyond Mr. Housman by citing Pollux iii. 39–40. The passage mentions a day of the Greek wedding festivities which was called *ἀπαυλία* . . . ἐν ᾗ ὁ νυμφίος εἰς τοῦ πενθεροῦ ἀπαυλίζεται ἀπὸ τῆς νύμφης. Below there follows this surprising information: καὶ τῷ μὲν νυμφίῳ τότε (on the occasion of the *ἀπαυλία*) ἐν τοῦ πενθεροῦ παιδίον ἀμφιθαλὲς θῆλυ συγκατακλίνεται, τῇ δὲ νύμφῃ ἐν τοῦ γαμβροῦ ἄρρεν (supp. *παιδίον ἀμφιθαλές*). Unfortunately, this entire context, as much of what the lexicographers have to tell about Greek marriage rites, is somewhat of a puzzle. As far as the reference to the custom goes, the statement of Pollux is unique. From other lexicographers we get little or nothing beyond a confusion of *ἐπαυλία* and *ἀπαυλία*. Hesychius *sub* γάμοι has ἡ δὲ δευτέρα (ἡμέρα τῶν γάμων) *ἀπαυλία*. Deubner, in an article entitled 'Επαύλια, *Jahrb. des D. Arch. Inst.* XV (1900), 147, takes the ground that *ἀπαυλία* in this passage is a textual error and unhesitatingly substitutes *ἐπαυλία*. This procedure is open to some criticism. I am not certain that Hesychius did not write *ἀπαυλία*, since it is clear that he was not aware that there was any vital distinction between the two words. For, in a previous passage which Deubner seems to have overlooked, *ἀπαυλία* and *ἐπαυλία* are defined as synonyms: *ἀπαυλία καὶ ἐπαυλία διχῶς λέγεται ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ . . . ἐπαυλίζεται τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἡ νύμφῃ (sub ἀπαυλία)*. What the *Etymologicum Magnum* has to say about the word *ἀπαυλία* is of no independent value. As in Hesychius, the origin of the term is connected with the departure of the bride from the house of her father to the home of her husband, whose bed and board she is henceforth to share: . . . ἄρχεται ἡ κόρη χωρὶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐλίζεσθαι ἢ τότε ἐπαυλίζεται τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἡ γυνή.

Modern criticism has necessarily been hampered by the unsatisfactory character of the data furnished by the lexicographers as to the *ἀπαυλία*. A glance at the handbooks will show that there is agreement on one point, namely, that the ceremony was observed on one of the days following the marriage. See, for example, Becker-

Göll *Charicles* III, 378-79; Hermann-Blümner *Griech. Priv. Alt.* 277, and n. 5. Deubner, in the paper just referred to, p. 147, n. 18, repeats the traditional view, suggesting that the sojourn of the bridegroom apart from his bride in the house of his father-in-law took place on one of the later days of the nuptial festivities. The order of definition in Pollux, *προαυλία*, *ἐπαυλία*, *ἀπαυλία* might seem to favor this explanation. However, if the passage in Pollux is to have the validity as a parallel which Puech accords it and is to be utilized in interpreting the text of the papyrus, the *ἀπαυλία* should be a prenuptial rite. Of this difficulty Puech did not take cognizance.

Now, there is an array of evidence, bearing on this point, which has been entirely overlooked by those who have busied themselves with the new Callimachus. This evidence is to be found neither in Greek authors nor in Latin, but in the nuptial *mores* of many peoples, civilized and uncivilized. In this day and generation, when Mannhardt and Frazer have shown the way, the classical philologist need present no apology if, in quest of light upon a religious usage or a social custom of the ancient world, he indulges in divagations into the realm of folk-lore. Here, in the present instance, we shall find the proof so evidently desirable that *κοῦρος* means *parvulus*. Incidentally, we shall learn what the primitive significance of this Naxian marriage custom was.

A fundamental tenet of folk belief is that the downfall of an enemy may be compassed or the heart of an obdurate lover melted if an image be subjected to the fate which it is desired shall befall the object of incantation. We can hardly overestimate the potency attributed to this process of imitative magic or simulation, as it is called, by all races of the olden times and by savage peoples today. Such practices as figure in the *Pharmaceutria* have been a favored theme in poetry and imaginative literature from the *Idylls* of Theocritus down to Rossetti's *Sister Helen*. A few examples out of many are Vergil *Ec.* 8. 75-82; Horace *Epod.* 17. 76; *Sat.* i. 8. 30 ff.; Ovid *Am.* iii. 7. 29 and *Her.* 6. 91. For a graphic picture of the prevalence and the persistence of mimetic rites it will suffice to refer the reader to *The Golden Bough*, I², 9 ff.

Simulation is likewise regarded as an efficacious means of curing

barren women. Among savage peoples a doll, fashioned from wood, cloth, or some other substance, is the *sine qua non* of the process. This puppet is carried about, fondled, and treated as if it were a child, or, as in the classic instance reported from the Babar Islands in the Malay Archipelago and described by Frazer (*op. cit.* I, 19; Ploss *Das Weib* I, 688, rev. ed.; Hartland *Primitive Paternity* [London, 1909-10] I, 146), may figure in an elaborate ritual in which the mimicry is even more realistic. Frazer cites only two examples of this use of simulation, but these are by no means isolated phenomena. By consulting Ploss and Hartland, the reader will discover that analogous practices are world-wide in extent. Their existence among African tribes, in Mexico, among the Eskimos of Behring Strait, and in Japan has been recorded by ethnologists and travelers.

This superstition does not manifest itself merely in the naïve usages of savage and non-European races. We find traces of it in much higher strata of civilization. This difference, however, is observable. By primitive man the process is resorted to as a remedy for proved sterility. Peoples of more advanced culture tend to act on the principle that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" and, therefore, to utilize simulation as a prophylactic. Consequently, the custom appears as a prenuptial rite or as a feature of the ceremonies of the wedding day. Furthermore, a flesh-and-blood child takes the place of the doll.

In a frequent form of the ceremony a male child is put on the lap of the bride at the wedding. Students of marriage customs have long since shown that this procedure is widely prevalent among Aryan peoples and that it may possibly have formed a part of the Indo-Germanic marriage ritual. It is prescribed in the *Āpastambīya-Gṛīhyasūtra* as follows—I quote from the version of Winternitz given in "Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell," *Denkschr. der Wien. Akad., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, XL (1892), 23: "Nun setzt er [der Bräutigam] . . . den Sohn einer [Frau] welche nur männliche Kinder geboren hat und deren Söhne am Leben sind, auf ihren Schoß, gibt diesem [Knaben] . . . Früchte und murmelt die beiden folgenden [Rig-verse]." In an exhaustive note on this passage (p. 75), Winternitz collects from Indian literature other allusions to the custom and

cites references which prove that it exists, or at least existed in the Punjab in modern times.

Among the Slavonic peoples of eastern and southeastern Europe, in Servia, Galicia, Bulgaria, and parts of Russia, the custom is well-nigh universal, as is shown by data collected by Leopold Schroeder, *Die Hochzeitsbräuche der Esten und einiger anderer finnisch-ugrischer Völkerschaften in Vergleichung mit denen der indogermanischen Völker* (Berlin, 1888) 123 ff., and Mannhardt, *Mythologische Forschungen* (Strassburg, 1884) 357. This material has been rendered easily accessible by Hartland, *Primitive Paternity* I, 141 ff.; see also by the same author *The Legend of Perseus* (London, 1894-96) I, 178. As we should expect, there are local variations in respect of the period in the wedding festivities at which the child is introduced and of the treatment accorded to it. The child may be handed to the bride while she sits her horse or rides in a wagon in the nuptial procession, or when she enters the house of her future lord, or as she foots it in the dance. Often the child is not held, but is merely kissed and handed back. Again, the child is put on the bride's lap while she sits at the wedding feast. Other places in Europe in which the rite appears are Finland—in Finnish there is a special word for *Schoosknabe*—and Corsica, where the bride receives the child from the hands of her husband's nearest relative and kisses it, while her kinsfolk wish her happiness, "tre di maschi e femmin' una."

My desire to emphasize the prevalence of this usage, and to show how deeply rooted in folk consciousness is the belief of which this rite is the outward manifestation, has led me to reproduce here some things that to the student of folk-lore are commonplaces of information. I must, however, call attention to a further variant of the ceremony. As recently as the last quarter of the nineteenth century, custom in Sweden prescribed that *on the night preceding the wedding* the prospective bride should sleep with a boy baby. If she did so, her firstborn would be a son; see L. Lloyd *Peasant Life in Sweden* (London, 1870) 85. Schroeder, p. 126, is authority for the statement that this is a prevalent superstition throughout Scandinavia. One is tempted to conjecture that, in the form of simulation practiced by the northern Teutons, the original rite has

survived in its primitive simplicity, whereas, among the Hindoos and the Slavs, there has developed a modified form in which the symbolism is, to our taste at least, more delicate. Such is the ordinary law of evolution in folk usage. On the other hand we should expect to find, as we climb the ladder of civilization, that less of the original realism remains. This is apparently not true in the present instance. Perhaps the safer course is merely to observe that we have to do with separate manifestations, more or less vivid, of the same folk concept and to deposit the question of origin and evolution in the laps of the anthropologists. At all events, we see that the Scandinavian form of the rite possesses for us great significance and brings us around to our point of departure, the papyrus.

The character and the purpose of the Naxian rite are now clear, it seems to me, beyond all peradventure. On the night preceding her wedding day, Cydippe took to her bed a boy of tender years, and this was the custom of the place. The act took its rise in the desire to render the forthcoming marriage fruitful and to enable the bride to become the mother of sons, "the pillars of the house." Simulation was the means by which the end wished for was to be attained. The lines of the papyrus thus take on a new importance. As I have previously remarked, students of marriage customs have suggested the possibility that the ceremony of the *Schoosknabe* is to be viewed as a part of the Indo-Germanic marriage ritual. However, no evidence for the existence of the rite among the Greeks or the Romans seems to have been cited. The passage in Pollux, owing doubtless to the lack of cognate testimony, has received only passing notice from those who have written about the marriage rites of the ancient Greeks and has been, I believe, quite neglected by the anthropologists. Now we find in some stray leaves from the works of a famous poet, whom the Egyptian dust-heaps have treated in a fashion all too niggardly, data which students of primitive culture will be glad to add to their store.

The maidens who participated in the rite were doubtless quite in the dark as to its real significance. Callimachus himself was ignorant of the original purpose of the ceremony, as was also the author of the Townley scholium on the *Iliad* xiv. 296, quoted by

Hunt and referred to by all who have concerned themselves with this part of the papyrus. For convenience I quote the comment of the scholiast:

εἰς εὐνὴν φοιτῶντε φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας· . . . διὸ καὶ μέχρι νῦν ὑπόμνημα φυλάσσεσθαι παρὰ Ναξίους καὶ τὸν ἀμφιθαλὴν τῇ τάλῃ¹ συγκατατεθείσθαι· ἄλλοι τὸν Δία φασὶν ἐν Σάμῳ λάθρα τῶν γονέων διαπαρθευῖναι τὴν Ἥραν. ὅθεν Σάμιοι ζήλῳ τῆς θεοῦ μνηστεύοντες τὰς κόρας λάθρα συγκοιμίζουσιν, εἴτα παρρησίᾳ τοὺς γάμους θύουσιν.

That impulse which moved the Greeks to throw the vesture of poetry about anything in cult usage or social custom that seemed to them to exhibit unattractive bareness has been operative here with an almost fatal facility. Callimachus or some predecessor fixed the *αἴτιον* of an incomprehensible rite in the clandestine union in which Zeus and Hera consummated their love. The Naxian prenuptial ceremony, therefore, was regarded as the local type of a set of ritual observances, commemorating the *ἱερὸς γάμος*, which existed in one form or another in many Greek lands. This explanation was repeated by the author of the scholium, which is, as Wilamowitz has pointed out (see Hunt *ad. loc.*), based directly on our passage and which contains a citation of l. 3.

The Samian marriage custom to which the scholiast alludes must be carefully distinguished from the Naxian ceremony. These are not parallel rites, although Wilamowitz regarded them as such in his article entitled "Hephaistos," *Nachr. der Gött. Akad. Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1895) 236, n. 43. However, the discovery of the papyrus had not then rendered a different interpretation of the Naxian usage possible. Puech, with less justification, refers to the Samian rite as an analogy. We cannot in this case go beyond the scholium and discover the source from which the comment is derived. We must, therefore, take at its face value the story that Samian suitors were granted conjugal rights before marriage. We are here confronted with a totally different sort of folk usage, that is, the trial marriage, an institution which has existed in simple or modified form, at different periods and in many climes—in early days even in our own country. But it is unnecessary to enter into a discussion

¹ τῇ Ἰρᾷ, Maass.

of this subject here. I wish merely to emphasize the fact that the scholiast's sole aim was to cite two customs which he believed commemorated the *ἱερὸς γάμος* of Zeus and Hera. We have, therefore, no right to infer that he viewed these ceremonies as identical in kind, but only in origin.

If, as I venture to hope, new light has been thrown on the original significance of the Naxian rite, *nous autres modernes* should not be hoodwinked into accepting as gospel truth the aetiological fancies of a poet or the secondhand knowledge of a scholiast. Is it a meticulous distinction to insist that one should not hereafter write, as does Housman, "We know . . . that the Naxians had a marriage custom commemorating the old scandal that Hera was not a virgin when she wedded Zeus"? What we know is that the Naxians had a marriage custom which they, or the poets for them, *thought* took its rise in the *furtum* of the Olympians—a conclusion which was naturally suggested by the frequency of ceremonies in which divine unions were symbolically depicted. I must likewise take issue with M. Puech, who, accepting literally the explanation of the poet, remarks that the rite was a *simulacre*, intended to recall the secret loves of Zeus and Hera: "le fiancé (!) est donc représenté par un tout jeune garçon." A symbol the child certainly was, but not of the husband-to-be. The rite was symbolical, but its symbolism was of a practical sort, not mimicry of a *chronique scandaleuse*. The child should be regarded as a harbinger, and not as a *succedaneum*.

I am loath to leave this subject without a word about the passage cited above from Pollux, which now has new claim for consideration. The lexicographer's account of the *ἀπανλία* is not to be viewed in the future as an isolated reference, but must be scrutinized in the light of what we have learned about simulation in general and the Naxian rite in particular. There can be no doubt that what Pollux tells us about the bride's part in the observance of the *ἀπανλία* is based on a substratum of truth. We cannot, however, blink the fact that the bridegroom is said to have performed, *mutatis mutandis*, a like ceremony. I know of no parallel in folk-lore which would corroborate this statement. In the simulative ritual of the Babar Archipelago the husband takes a prominent part, and Winternitz mentions a tribe of Southern India in which the bride hands the

child to the bridegroom, who kisses it, then hands it back. These usages, of course, have not the force of analogies. Everywhere, as we should expect in the nature of the case, when simulation is resorted to as a prophylactical or a remedial measure against sterility, it is the woman on whom the magic influence is centered. So the assertion of Pollux that the bridegroom figured as prominently as the bride in the rite of the ἀπαυλία is, to say the least, surprising. At any rate, I am not persuaded to grant to the passage the merit of preserving independent information concerning the practice of simulation in ancient Greece merely because it adds this feature to the description of the rite contained in the papyrus. I am inclined to think that the lexicographer's account simply incorporates a tradition of the Naxian custom with various embellishments as to details, the source of which it is impossible to fix. Common to both the lexicographer and the poet is the ritualistic prescription that the child shall be *patrimus et matrimus*. This point is not without significance. The fact that Pollux does not restrict the ceremony in locality cannot be cited as proof that the custom was generally in vogue, or was even observed sporadically, in Greece. It is typical of the methods of the lexicographers not to descend to such minutiae but to endow the particular with the currency of the universal. Especially is it true that much of what we find in all the sources on the subject of Greek wedding ceremonies has only a local application.

I have previously referred to the theory set forth in the handbooks that the ἀπαυλία was a term applied to one of the days which followed the wedding. If the results of our study are accepted and the custom which Pollux describes is to be classed with the Naxian rite and with the kindred usages which have been mentioned, the ἀπαυλία can only have been a prenuptial ceremony. This explanation of the word, which is the time-honored one found in Liddell and Scott, should be rehabilitated. A little reflection, I think, will show that the opinion advanced in the handbooks, to the effect that the ἀπαυλία was observed after the marriage had been consummated, is based on evidence that will not stand scrutiny. There is nothing inherent in the meaning of the word to restrict its application to the period subsequent to the wedding. Unlike its analogues, προαυλία

and ἐπαυλία, ἀπαυλία does not define a time but describes an act—"a sleeping apart." We have, therefore, no right to infer, because the order of definition in Pollux runs προαυλία, ἐπαυλία, ἀπαυλία, that the term last named designated a day subsequent to the wedding, as did the second. Pollux was giving an account of a ceremony which, for all we are told to the contrary, may well have taken place on the night of the προαυλία.

It is easy to reconstruct the notion that inspired the statements of the later lexicographers quoted in part on p. 305. They assumed, as a matter of course, that the withdrawal implied in ἀπαυλία could only refer to the departure of the young wife from her father's house to take her place in the abode of her husband. Any other interpretation save the obvious one would naturally not have occurred to them, uncritical compilers as they were of facts foreign to their own experience. They could have had no personal knowledge of such an obscure, if not unique, folk custom as was the Naxian rite. Explaining ἀπαυλία in terms of the probabilities as a post-nuptial ceremony, they merged it with the familiar ἐπαυλία and gave it the same wide currency. Hence the identification of the two words by Hesychius and the absurd comment in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: 'Απαυλία· έορτή παρὰ 'Αθηναίοις κ.τ.λ.

A word as to the right of ἄρσειν to its place in l. 3 of the papyrus and I am done. Leo, I believe, is the only one who has followed Hunt and adopted the variant αὐτίκα found in the scholium on Soph. *Ant.* 629. Consequently, ἄρσειν perhaps needs no lengthy justification, especially in view of Housman's strong defense of the reading on formal grounds of criticism. I wish simply to add, as an argument for the retention of ἄρσειν, a point which the line of study followed in this paper has suggested. Among peoples where the custom of the *Schooskind* has survived, it is a rule well-nigh universal that the child must be a boy. Schroeder mentions only two districts in which the sex of the child is a secondary consideration. There can be no doubt that in the primitive ceremony no deviation from the niceties of the ritual would have been permissible. Now, in ll. 2 and 3 we have a poetic version of the folk ordinance which governed the procedure. The clause τέθμιον ὡς ἐκέλευε is a proof of this and l. 3, with the quaint τᾶλιν, seems to

echo the conventional, ritualistic phraseology. *Ἄρσενι* is the all-important prescription and must necessarily have been emphasized, especially because without it *παιδὶ σὺν ἀμφιθαλεῖ* would be quite ambiguous and hence out of keeping with the minute precision of expression essential to the rituals and formulae of all times. *Ἄρσενι* is, therefore, indispensable.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY